

OCT 05 1999

24 MS. DOLE: Good evening. I'll be brief. My
25 name is Anne Dole. I work for the state of Idaho
1 for the INEEL oversight program. Sorry that I was
2 late getting here. I wasn't able to get away from
3 office. I would also like to recognize
4 Jack Barraclough from our area, representative to
5 state legislature.

6 Just a few things to let you know, we
7 are reviewing the EIS as a state agency. We will
8 be compiling comments from various state agencies
9 and putting those together in a single letter from
10 the state on the EIS, and we will do so hopefully
11 well in advance of the extended deadline.

12 I can tell you though that we have two
13 very big concerns, and I will just mention them
1 14 now. They are is the RCRA issue and the fact that
15 Yucca Mountain and DOE have had a couple policies
16 now but they will not accept RCRA waste in Yucca
17 Mountain.

2 18 The second policy is metric tons of
19 heavy metal, and the way in which DOE has chosen to
20 determine how much or how many metric tons of heavy
21 metal are present in high level waste.

1 22 I would just say briefly that all of the
23 high-level waste that INEEL, which is either in
24 form waiting to be treated or in liquid form ready
25 to be treated is an RCRA waste, and it contains

(1)

1

1 both characteristic and listed waste.

2 Now, you can treat the characteristic
3 waste, but listed in, listed out. And in order to
4 get that listing designation off of waste you have
5 to go through a delisting process through the EPA
6 through the state. It is very difficult and has
7 been proven to be very onerous and often less than
8 successful process. Now INE has high-level waste,
9 yes. All of Hanford's waste is high-level waste,
10 is RCRA waste.

11 So under the current policy Yucca
12 Mountain is exercising with respect to RCRA waste
13 the 4600 metric tons of heavy metal that have been
14 allocated in the mountain for high-level waste.
15 Probably won't have any takers. Now, we all know
16 the Savannah River. Well, they managed to get
17 around RCRA through clean water DPS permit.
18 Frankly, I don't think that will fly in the end
19 either.

20 So we urge DOE to please address this
21 issue because the mountain has 4600 metric tons of
22 heavy metals allocated to high-level wastes and
23 your current policy would preclude to accepting it.

24 And the gentleman who spoke before me spoke about
25 the settlement agreement and the target date of

1 2035, and the expectations that this waste will be
2 ready to go and there will be a place to take it.

2 ... 3 The second issue is the metric tons of
4 heavy metal. Even if you can solve this delisting
5 problem or change in policy to accept RCRA waste,
6 the current way in which DOE determines equivalency
7 in high-level waste would create a number --
8 numbers of metric tons of heavy metal that
9 basically would preclude half of the high-level
10 waste now in your inventory from going into the
11 mountain even if you agree to accept RCRA waste.

12 So these are two show stoppers. I mean, yes, spent
13 nuclear fuel is one issue, but the high-level waste
14 is another. And so I can assure you that we are
15 very concerned about these two policies.

2 ... 16 Metric tons of heavy metal issue, you
17 could either change the way in which you determine
18 equivalency and there are ways of doing that using
19 relative risk rather than the calculation that is
20 currently used. Or you can go to Congress and get
21 them to change the amount of metric tons of heavy
22 metal that will be accepted by the mountain.

23 Currently the Nuclear Waste Policy Act
24 puts it at 70 thousand metric tons. You could ask
25 our Congress to change that number. But currently,

2 | 1 as I said, even if you solve this RCRA problem and
2 | 2 agree to accept RCRA waste you couldn't accept half
3 | 3 of the amount under the current allocated
4 | 4 inventory.

5 | These comments, by the way, we are
6 | putting in the high-level waste EIS that is due out
7 | on INEEL. There will be a clearly-stated state
8 | position. And you will hear it again from us in
9 | comments on this EIS.

10 | But having said all that I do want to
11 | commend you on the monumental work that you have
12 | produced. It is a very, very complicated issue.
13 | And we hope that we as a state will do justice by
14 | reviewing it and giving you helpful and adequate
15 | comments. Thank you.

16 | MS. SWEENEY: Thank you.

17 | MR. BROWN: Thank you. Thanks very much. Is
18 | there anyone else in the audience at this point who
19 | would care to make a comment? All right. If on
20 | reflection someone who has already spoken would
21 | like to add what they said, just let me know. Or
22 | if someone else arrives a bit late for the meeting
23 | indicates that they wish to comment, we will
24 | reconvene.

25 | At this point we will recess, and as I

(4)

1 said, we will reconvene if anyone else indicates an
2 interest in making a comment. We are scheduled to
3 remain here through 10 o'clock to take comments, so
4 we will be available. I appreciate it. Thanks all
5 for your comments up to this point. We will
6 recess.

7 (Recess at 8:12 p.m.)

8 MR. BROWN: We have a gentleman who would
9 like to make a comment. If you all will take your
10 seats we will reconvene. I think we are ready. If
11 you will step to the microphone and identify
12 yourself. Thanks a lot.

⑥